1	Peter Strojnik, State Bar No. 6464				
2	STROJNIK P.C. 2375 East Camelback Road Suite 600				
3	Phoenix, Arizona 85016				
4	Telephone: (602) 524-6602 ADA@strojnik.com				
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff				
6	UNITED STATES D				
7	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA				
8	Case No:				
9	FERNANDO GASTELUM,	VERIFIED COMPLAINT			
10	Plaintiff,	1. Americans with Disabilities			
11	, i	Act			
12	VS.	2. Negligence3. Negligent			
13	v 3.	Misrepresentation			
14	V & P, L.L.C.,	4. Failure to Disclose			
	Defendant.	5. Fraud / Consumer Fraud			
15		JURY TRIAL REQUESTED			
16					
17	INTRODU	CTION			
18	INTRODUCTION				
19	1. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to t	ne Americans with Disabilities Act, 42			
20	U.S.C. §12101 et seq. and corresponding regulations, 28 CFR Part 36 and				
21	Department of Justice Standards for Acc	cessible Design ("ADA").			
22	2 DI: 4:02 1 0 1	1 D1: 4:00 :4 41 :1 0			
23	2. Plaintiff's left leg is amputated below the	he knee. Plaintiff moves with the aid of			
24	a wheelchair or a prosthetic leg. Plaintiff suffers from a disability as this term				
25	is defined in 42 U.S.C. 12102 and 28 (CFR §36.105 (c)(1)(i) which includes,			
26	inter alia "wallzing standing sitting ra	aching lifting [and] handing" and other			
27	inter alia, "walking, standing, sitting, rea	aching, mung fand bending and other			
28					

- activities. A partial missing limb "substantially limit[s] musculoskeletal function" as a matter of law. 28 CFR \S 36.105 (d)(2)(iii)(D).
- 3. Plaintiff is constantly and relentlessly segregated and discriminated against, excluded, denied equal services, or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of his disability, and has been denied the opportunity to participate in or benefit from services, facilities and opportunities available people without disabilities.
- 4. Plaintiff incorporates herein Congressional Findings and Purpose set forth in 42 U.S.C. §12-101 and 28 CFR §36.101.
- 5. Plaintiff is being subjected to discrimination on the basis of disability in violation of Subchapter III of the Americans with Disabilities Act or has reasonable ground to believe that that he is about to be subjected to discrimination in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12183.
- 6. Plaintiff alleges that he has actual notice that Defendant has failed to comply with Subchapter III of the ADA, 28 CFR 36 and the 2010 Standards of Accessibility Design ("2010 Standards") as more fully alleged below.
- 7. Plaintiff alleges that he has no obligation to engage in futile gestures as referenced in 42 U.S.C. §12188(A)(1) and 28 C.F.R. Subpart E
- 8. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff by all of the following actions and failures to act –

- a. Failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures which are necessary to afford Plaintiff and others similarly situated accessibility to Defendant's place of public accommodation, thus violating 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(ii) and 28 C.F.R. §36.302(a); and
- b. Failing to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services, thus violating 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(iii); and
- c. Failing to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable, thus violating 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(2)(A)(iii), 28 CFR 36 and the 2010 Standards..

PARTIES

- 9. Plaintiff is a disabled person and a committed individual to advance the time when places of public accommodations will be compliant with the ADA.
- 10.Plaintiff's disability includes the amputation of the left leg below the knee.

 Plaintiff moves with the use of a wheelchair, walker and/or a prostethis.
- 11.Defendant V & P, L.L.C. D/B/A Comfort Suites Phoenix Airport owns and/or operates hotel at 1625 S. 52nd Street, Phoenix, AZ 85281, which is a public accommodation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(A) which offers public lodging services. *See* 28 CFR §36.104 and a listing of public accommodations in 42 U.S.C. §12181(7).

JURISDICTION 1 2 12. District Court has jurisdiction over this case or controversy by virtue of 28 3 U.S.C. §§ 28-1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188 and 28 U.S.C. § 1367. 4 5 13. Plaintiff brings this action as a private attorney general who has been personally 6 subjected to discrimination on the basis of his disability, see 42 U.S.C.12188 7 and 28 CFR §36.501. 14. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391. 9 10 STANDING TO SUE JURISDICTION 11 15. Plaintiff reviewed 3rd party and 1st party lodging websites to book an 12 13 ambulatory and wheelchair accessible room. Plaintiff was denied equal 14 opportunity to use and enjoyment of a critical public accommodation through 15 Defendant's acts of discrimination and segregation alleged below. 16 17 16. Plaintiff intends to book a room at the Defendant's hotel once Defendant has 18 removed all accessibility barriers, including the ones not specifically referenced 19 herein, and has fully complied with the ADA. 20 21 17. Because of Defendant's denial of Plaintiff's use and enjoyment of a critical 22 public accommodation through Defendant's acts of discrimination and 23 segregation, he is deterred from visiting that accommodation by accessibility 24 25 barriers and other violations of the ADA. 26 18. Defendant has denied Plaintiff -27 28

- a. The opportunity to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations at its hotel.
- b. The right to be included in the population at large who benefits from Defendant's hotel without being segregated because his disability.
- 19.Plaintiff intends to book a room at Defendant's hotel in the future but he will likely suffer repeated injury unless and until the barriers of accessibility and ambulatory and wheelchair accessibility barriers have been removed.

CONTINUING JURISDICTION

- 20.ADA violations which form the subject matter of this Verified Complaint change frequently due to regular maintenance, remodels, repairs, and normal wear and tear.
- 21.Defendant's ADA Violations are of the type that can reasonably be expected to start up again, allowing Defendant to be free to return to the old ways' after the threat of a lawsuit had passed.
- 22. If one or more ADA violation are cured, Plaintiff alleges that they were cured and timed to anticipate the current lawsuit, and not as a good faith effort to comply with the ADA.
- 23.To remedy the violations of 28 CFR 36.302(e), Defendant would be required not only to modify all 1st and 3rd party lodging websites, but would be required to do so truthfully and accurately.

1 **COUNT ONE** 2 Violation of Plaintiff's Civil Rights under the ADA 3 24. Plaintiff realleges all allegations heretofore set forth. 4 25. By virtue of his disability, Plaintiff requires an ADA compliant lodging facility 5 6 particularly applicable to his mobility, both ambulatory and wheelchair assisted. 7 26.On or about January 26, 2018 Plaintiff visited a 3rd party website 9 www.expedia.com to book a room. 10 27.3rd party website disclosed general availability and description of Defendant's 11 hotel. 12 13 28.3rd party website failed to identify and describe mobility related accessibility 14 features and guest rooms offered through its reservations service in enough 15 detail to reasonably permit Plaintiff to assess independently whether 16 17 Defendant's hotel meets his accessibility needs. 18 29.3rd party website failed to disclose the following accessibility features in 19 enough detail to reasonably permit Plaintiff to assess independently whether 20 21 Defendant's hotel and guest rooms meets his accessibility needs: 22 a. Whether accessible routes comply with § 206 of the 2010 Standards; and 23 b. Whether operable parts on accessible elements, accessible routes and 24 25 accessible rooms comply with §§205 and 803 of the 2010 Standards; and 26 c. Whether any accessible means of egress comply with §207 of the 2010

27

28

Standards.

1	d.	Whether parking spaces comply with §§208 and 502 of the 2010
2		Standards; and
3 4	e.	Whether passenger loading zones comply with §§209 and 503 of the
5		2010 Standards; and
6	f.	Whether any drinking fountains comply with §211 of the 2010 Standards;
7		and
8 9	σ	Whether any kitchens, kitchenettes and sinks comply with §§212 and 804
0	ξ.	of the 2010 Standards; and
11		
12	h.	Whether toilet facilities and bathing facilities comply with §213 of the
13 14		2010 Standards; and
15	i.	Whether any washing machines and clothes dryers comply with §§214
16		and 611 of the 2010 Standards; and
17	j.	Whether accessible hotel rooms comply with §224 of the 2010 Standards;
18		and
19 20	k.	Whether dining surfaces and work surfaces comply with §\$226 and 902
21		of the 2010 Standards; and
22	1.	Whether sales and service elements comply with §227 of the 2010
23		Standards; and
24 25	m	
26	111.	Whether any saunas and steam rooms comply with §§241 and 612 of the
27		2010 Standards; and
$_{28}$		

cc. Whether any platform lifts comply with §410 of the 2010 Standards; and
dd. Whether any stairways comply with §504 of the 2010 Standards; and
ee. Whether handrails on elements requiring handrails comply with §505 of
the 2010 Standards; and

- ff. Whether the plumbing facilities comply with Chapter 6 of the 2010 Standards with respect to all the following subchapters of Chapter 6: §§ 602 (drinking fountains), 603 (toilets and bathing rooms), 604 (water closets and toilet compartments, 605 (urinals), 606 (lavatories and sinks), 607 (bathtubs), 607 (shower compartments), 608 (grab bars), 610 (seats in bathtubs and shower compartments), and
- gg. Whether service counters comply with 904 of the 2010 Standards.
- 30. Additionally, 3rd party website did not permit Plaintiff to book a room for the stated reason that accessible room was either not available or not guaranteed.
- 31. Thereafter, Plaintiff consulted Defendant's 1st party website choicehotels.com to determine the information unavailable from the third-party website.
- 32.1st party website failed to identify and describe mobility related accessibility features and guest rooms offered through its reservations service in enough detail to reasonably permit Plaintiff to assess independently whether Defendant's hotel meets his accessibility needs.

- 33.In particular, 1st party website failed to disclose the following accessibility features in enough detail to reasonably permit Plaintiff to assess independently whether Defendant's hotel and guest rooms meets his accessibility needs:
 - a. Whether accessible routes comply with § 206 of the 2010 Standards; and
 - b. Whether operable parts on accessible elements, accessible routes and accessible rooms comply with §§205 and 803 of the 2010 Standards; and
 - c. Whether any accessible means of egress comply with §207 of the 2010 Standards.
 - d. Whether parking spaces comply with §§208 and 502 of the 2010 Standards; and
 - e. Whether passenger loading zones comply with §\$209 and 503 of the 2010 Standards; and
 - f. Whether any drinking fountains comply with §211 of the 2010 Standards; and
 - g. Whether any kitchens, kitchenettes and sinks comply with §\$212 and 804 of the 2010 Standards; and
 - h. Whether toilet facilities and bathing facilities comply with §213 of the
 2010 Standards; and
 - i. Whether any washing machines and clothes dryers comply with §§214
 and 611 of the 2010 Standards; and

v.	Whether the operating parts on accessible features comply with §30)9 of
	the 2010 Standards; and	

- w. Whether accessible routes comply with §402 of the 2010 Standards; and
- x. Whether walking surfaces comply with §403 of the 2010 Standards; and
- y. Whether doors, doorways and gates comply with §404 of the 2010 Standards; and
- z. Whether ramps comply with § 405 of the 2010 Standards; and aa. Whether curb ramps comply with §406 of the 2010 Standards; and bb. Whether any elevators comply with §407 of the 2010 Standards; and cc. Whether any platform lifts comply with §410 of the 2010 Standards; and dd. Whether any stairways comply with §504 of the 2010 Standards; and ee. Whether handrails on elements requiring handrails comply with §505 of the 2010 Standards; and
- ff. Whether the plumbing facilities comply with Chapter 6 of the 2010 Standards with respect to all the following subchapters of Chapter 6: §§ 602 (drinking fountains), 603 (toilets and bathing rooms), 604 (water closets and toilet compartments, 605 (urinals), 606 (lavatories and sinks), 607 (bathtubs), 607 (shower compartments), 608 (grab bars), 610 (seats in bathtubs and shower compartments), and

gg. Whether service counters comply with 904 of the 2010 Standards.

34.Thereafter	Plaintiff	called	Defendant's	hotel	to	inquire	whether	it	was
compliant v	with the A	DA and	l suitable for F	Plaintif	f's a	accessibi	lity needs		

- 35.Plaintiff spoke with hotel reservations clerk, Michelle. Plaintiff specifically inquired whether Defendant's hotel was compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act and compliant with the specific requirements of accessibility.
- 36.Reservations clerk responded that the hotel was compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Plaintiff booked a room.
- 37.Upon booking the room, Plaintiff noted that the Hotel was not compliant with the ADA and was replete with accessibility barriers in the details which include the following areas of non-compliance:
 - a. **208.3.1.** The accessible parking is not dispersed to all entrances.
 - b. **502.4.** There are multiple accessible parking spaces which have a running slope steeper than 1:48 inches.
 - c. **502.4.** Both of the access aisles have a running slope steeper than 1:48 inches.
 - d. **502.6.** All of the accessible parking signs are lower than the required 60 inch minimum.
 - e. **303.2.** Multiple accessible routes have a vertical change in level higher than 1/4 inch.
 - f. **305.3.** The clear floor space on one side of the bed in the accessible guest room is less than the required minimum of 30 inches.

- g. **309.4.** The accessible room door requires a twisting of the wrist motion and more than 5 pounds of force to open.
- h. **309.4.** Stairway entrances require a twisting of the wrist motion and more than 5 pounds of force to open.
- i. **309.4.** The secondary entrances all require a twisting of the wrist motion and more than 5 pounds of force to open.
- j. **309.4.** The lobby restroom door requires a twisting of the wrist motion and more than 5 pounds of force to open.
- k. **309.4.** The fitness center door requires a twisting of the wrist motion to open.
- 1. **309.4.** The exit door to the pool area requires more than 5 pounds of force to open.
- m. **309.4.** The gate handle to the pool requires a twisting of the wrist motion to open.
- n. **403.3.** Multiple accessible routes have a walking surface with a cross slope steeper than 1:48 inches.
- o. **404.2.3.** The clear width of the doorway in the accessible guest bathroom is less than 32 inches.
- p. **405.2.** Multiple curb ramps have a running slope steeper than 1:12 inches.
- q. **405.8.** The ramp on the northern side of the hotel has a rise greater than 6 inches without handrails.
- r. 406.5. Curb ramp projects into vehicular lanes.

1	s. 503.3. The passenger loading zone does not have a marked access aisle.				
2	t. 604.6. The lobby restroom water closet's flush controls are on the closed side				
3	of the water closet.				
5	u. 607.4.2.1. The accessible guest room bathtub has only one grab bar for the				
	u. 007.4.2.1. The accessione guest room bannub has only one grab bar for the				
6 7	back wall.				
8	v. 607.4.2.2. The accessible guest room bathtub does not have a grab bar for				
9	the control end wall				
10	w. 607.4.2.3. The accessible guest room bathtub does not have a grab bar for				
11	w. 607.4.2.5. The decessione guest foom builtub does not have a grab but for				
12	the head end wall; and				
13	x. Other ADA violations to be discovered through a discovery process.				
14	38.Plaintiff paid for the room.				
15 16	39. The removal of accessibility barriers listed above is readily achievable.				
17	40. As a direct and proximate result of ADA Violations, Plaintiff's Disability has				
18					
19	prevented him from equal access to the Defendant's public accommodation.				
20	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for all relief as follows:				
21	A. Relief described in 42 U.S.C. §2000a – 3; and				
22	B. Relief described in 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a) and (b) and, particularly -				
23	B. Rener described in 42 0.5.c. § 12100(a) and (b) and, particularly				
24	C. Injunctive relief order to alter Defendant's place of public				
25	accommodation to make it readily accessible to and usable by ALL				
26	individuals with disabilities; and				
27	individuals with disabilities, and				
28					

¹ 42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(2)

- 46.Discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in the use and enjoyment of critical public accommodations².
- 47.Defendant's knowing and intentional persistence in discrimination against Plaintiff is alleged, causing Plaintiff damage.
- 48.Individuals with disabilities, including Plaintiff, continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser services, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities³.
- 49.Defendant's knowing and intentional discrimination against Plaintiff reinforces above forms of discrimination, causing Plaintiff damage.
- 50. Census data, national polls, and other studies have documented that people with disabilities, as a group, occupy an inferior status in our society, and are severely disadvantaged socially, vocationally, economically, and educationally⁴.
- 51.Defendant's knowing and intentional discrimination has relegated Plaintiff to an inferior status in society, causing Plaintiff damage.

^{27 | 242} U.S.C. §12101(a)(3)

³ 42 U.S.C. §12101(a)(5)

⁴ 42 U.S.C. §12101(a)(6)

52. The Nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for such individuals⁵.

- 53.Defendant's knowing and intentional discrimination has worked counter to our Nation's goals of equality, causing Plaintiff damage.
- 54.Continued existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and nonproductivity⁶.
- 55.Defendant's knowing and intentional unfair and unnecessary discrimination against Plaintiff demonstrates Defendant's knowing and intentional damage to Plaintiff.
- 56.Defendant's breach of duty caused Plaintiff damages including, without limitation, the feeling of segregation, discrimination, relegation to second class citizen status the pain, suffering and emotional damages inherent to discrimination and segregation and other damages to be proven at trial.
- 57.By violating Plaintiff's civil rights, Defendant engaged in intentional, aggravated and outrageous conduct.

⁵ 42 U.S.C. §12101(a)(7)

⁶ 42 U.S.C. §12101(a)(8)

1	58. The ADA has been the law of the land since 1991, but Defendant engaged in a			
2	conscious action of a reprehensible character, that is, Defendant denied Plaintiff			
3	his civil rights, and cause him damage by virtue of segregation, discrimination,			
4	mis civil rights, and cause min damage by virtue of segregation, discrimination,			
5	relegation to second class citizen status the pain, suffering and emotional			
6	damages inherent to discrimination and segregation and other damages to be			
7				
8	proven at trial			
9	59.Defendant either intended to cause injury to Plaintiff or defendant consciously			
10	pursued a course of conduct knowing that it created a substantial risk of			
11				
12	significant harm to Plaintiff.			
13	60.Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for punitive damages in an amount to be proven			
14	at trial sufficient, however, to deter this Defendant and others similarly situate			
15				
16	from pursuing similar acts.			
17	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:			
18	A. For finding of negligence; and			
19				
20	B. For damages in an amount to be proven at trial; and			
21	C. For punitive damages to be proven at trial; and			
22	D. For such other and further relief as the Court may doom just and proper			
23	D. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.			
24	COUNT THREE			
25	Negligent Misrepresentation			
26	61.Plaintiff realleges all allegations heretofore set forth.			
27				

1	77.Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for punitive damages in an amount to be proven
2	at trial sufficient, however, to deter this Defendant and others similarly situated
3	from pursuing similar acts.
5	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:
6	WILLIE ORE, I lament prays for tener as follows.
7	A. For finding of that Defendant failed to disclose information; and
8	B. For damages in an amount to be proven at trial; and
9	C. For punitive damages to be proven at trial; and
10	D. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
11	
12	COUNT FIVE Fraud
13	Common Law and Consumer
14	78.Plaintiff realleges all allegations heretofore set forth.
15 16	79.Defendant made a representation as alleged above.
17	80. The representation was material.
18	81. The representation was false.
19	or. The representation was raise.
20	82.Defendant knew that the representation was false or was ignorant to the truth or
21	falsity thereof.
22	83.Defendant intended that Plaintiff rely on the false representation.
23	
24	84.Plaintiff reasonably relied on the misrepresentation.
25	85. Plaintiff has a right to rely on the misrepresentation.
26	86.Plaintiff was unaware of the falsity of the representation until after he booked
27	
28	the room.

1	87.Plaintiff was consequently and proximately damaged by Defendant's
2	misrepresentation.
3	28 Defendant's migrapresentation was made in connection with the sale or
4	88.Defendant's misrepresentation was made in connection with the sale or
5	advertisement of merchandise with the intent that Plaintiff rely on it.
6 7	89.Renting of hotel rooms is "merchandise" as this term is defined in A.R.S. §44-
8	1521(5).
9	90. Plaintiff relied on the misrepresentation.
10	91.Plaintiff suffered an injury resulting from the false misrepresentation
1112	92.Defendant either intended to cause injury to Plaintiff or defendant consciously
13	pursued a course of conduct knowing that it created a substantial risk of
14	significant harm to Plaintiff.
1516	93.Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for punitive damages in an amount to be proven
17	at trial sufficient, however, to deter this Defendant and others similarly situated
18	from pursuing similar acts.
19 20	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief as follows:
21	A. For finding of that Defendant failed to disclose information; and
22	A. I of finding of that Defendant fance to disclose information, and
23	B. For damages in an amount to be proven at trial; and
24	C. For punitive damages to be proven at trial; and
25	D. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
26	REQUEST FOR TRIAL BY JURY
2728	Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by jury in issues triable by a jury.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30th day of January, 2018. STROJNIK, P.C. Profit-Peter Strojnik, 6464 Attorneys for Plaintiff **VERIFICATION** Plaintiff verifies that he has read the forgoing and that the factual allegations stated above are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information and belief. Plaintiff makes this verification under the penalty of perjury. /s/ Fernando Gastelum **Authorized Electronically**